

Secondly, there is established a seven-man Commission for Equality of Opportunity in Employment. This Commission shall have the power to investigate discrimination in employment in any business concern which holds a Federal Government contract or any labor union which works on such contract. I stress, this authority is limited to Federal Government contracts. In addition, employment agencies which are wholly or partially financed by Federal funds shall be subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, while equality of job opportunity in Federal employment is placed under the Commission's inspection.

If the Commission finds a clear pattern of discrimination, it is given the authority to cut off Government contracts, halt the flow of funds to employment agencies, and order labor organizations to cease discriminating, at the risk of running afoul of nondiscrimination amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. In granting such authority to the Commission, however, we have sought to impose strict safeguards for the rights of all individuals. The right to judicial review is concisely spelled out, while the party affected is given the opportunity to end discriminatory practices prior to the issuance of a formal order by the Commission.

This civil rights bill also authorizes the Attorney General to institute a civil action on behalf of a citizen who claims that he is being denied the opportunity to enroll in a nonsegregated public school. In so granting this right, however, a Federal court is restrained from enjoining a State or local official in such civil action, if there has been instituted a plan to desegregate with all deliberate speed, and unless the complainant has exhausted all State legal remedies.

In the same vein, this civil rights bill authorizes Federal appropriations to aid state or local school boards in desegregating, if a request is made by them for such assistance. The financial aid so authorized, however, is limited to administrative and special, nonteaching professional services, developmental programs and technical assistance. The payment of teachers' salaries, or the financing of construction costs are in no way involved.

Finally, this civil rights bill provides that anyone, otherwise qualified to vote in a Federal election, is presumed to have sufficient literacy and intelligence to vote if he has completed six grades of an accredited elementary school. This provision, of course, does not eliminate the right of a State to use literacy or other intelligence tests as a means of qualifying voters. Even if an individual has a sixth-grade education, the State may show that he is, in fact, illiterate. But the bill does provide a presumption of literacy which will materially assist a court in determining whether literacy tests—and tests of a similar nature—are being used in a manner which unfairly discriminate against certain classes of citizens.

Here, then, is a comprehensive bill which seeks to advance the cause of civil rights in the United States. At the same

time, however, it is a bill keyed to moderation. And the reason for moderation is obvious. We members of the Republican Party are honestly desirous of proposing legislation which stands a chance of enactment. Anyone, of course, can introduce grandiose legislative schemes. But, reaching for the sky, rather than aiming for the possible is a form of showmanship we do not wish to engage in. Reality is what we live by and accomplishment is what we seek.

Of equal importance is the fact that we are a Nation of many people and many views. In such a nation, the prime purpose of a legislator, from wherever he may come, is to accommodate the interests, desires, wants and needs of all our citizens. To alienate some in order to satisfy others is not only a disservice to those we alienate, but a violation of the principles of our Republic. For, only in compromise, moderation, and understanding are we able to fashion our society into a cohesive and durable structure.

I sincerely hope that all Members of Congress, of the executive department and the public will carefully study this proposed legislation and reach out to support it in the spirit in which it is introduced. The sincerity of its purpose, the moderation of its scope, and the reality of intended accomplishment should, we hope, attract wide support.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] has announced the introduction of his civil rights bill. I am sure that it is unnecessary to state that I shall oppose it. However, I do think it in order to state a few reasons why I think legislation in this field to be unwise, particularly at this time.

Members of this body have been told for years by other Members, principally from the South, that this problem will be worked out in time if left alone. Despite the apparent unwillingness of many to listen to this line of reasoning, the fact, nevertheless, continues to be true. Sometimes I wonder if those who are so vociferous in this field actually want the problem to be solved. So many have run against the South on this political playhouse for so long that they must shudder when they consider the prospect of losing this issue.

Recent events in the South have shown that progress is being made in the field of race relations. Recent events in my own State are an example. But what has been done has been done in spite of, rather than because of, any action taken on this floor or on the floor of the other body. And further action here will serve but one purpose—the continuing, unrelenting, perpetual harassment of the South. Must our people forever be the political scapegoat for vote-hungry politicians?

Mr. Speaker, let us devote our time and our energies to the pursuit of more urgent matters. Let us let the people of the South work out their problems in a peaceful atmosphere while we spend our efforts in finding solutions to the real issues of our time.

OBJECTOR COMMITTEES, CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to announce the assignments to the objector committees on our side of the aisle.

On the Consent Calendar the objectors will be the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELL], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

On the Private Calendar there will be the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE BAY OF PIGS INVASION

(Mr. HARVEY of Indiana asked and given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, at a recent press conference President Kennedy in explaining his responsibility for the Bay of Pigs invasion failure, stated that he had been misquoted by Jack Gore, the editor of the Fort Lauderdale News. Mr. Gore happens to be a friend of mine and he has written me concerning this colloquy which took place between him and the President. I wish to include a letter from Mr. Gore and certain quotes from his paper, the Fort Lauderdale News:

JANUARY 29, 1963.

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your recent note and the enclosed copy of the President's press conference anent the Bay of Pigs issue.

I quite agree with you that there are some aspects of the President's answer which are quite puzzling and which hardly jibe with the true facts. It has always seemed strange to me that President Kennedy and his brother would go so far out on a limb to ransom the Cuban prisoners, and now more or less promise them a GI bill of rights, unless they had a guilty conscience about pulling back the air cover which had been promised and which, if it had been used then, could well have saved the whole situation.

I know there are quite a few other people besides myself who are aware of the fact that air cover had been planned for this invasion and was pulled back. And, while Mr. John Knight has said he doesn't recall the subject coming up at the President's luncheon on May 10, 1961, in his Sunday Notebook of January 27, he wrote that the President had actually ordered planes into the air to help the invaders, but they had been called back when it was determined it was too late to save the invading forces.

This is information that was also passed on to us at the luncheon, and it is very strange to me that Mr. Knight would recall this particular item and not be able to remember some of the other things that were discussed.

I note, also, that in this week's National Observer, the comment is made that the President had previously been quoted as saying he had ordered U.S. air cover withheld at the last moment. The National Observer goes on to point out that at least four mem-

bers of the Cuban Exile Air Force had declared that they had been promised air coverage in writing and had actually seen the orders granting their request for air cover.

Under all these circumstances, I am not about to change my story about what the President told Florida editors, and, for your information, my mail has been running almost 99 percent in favor of my stand ever since the first story appeared.

I am enclosing, herewith, complete copies of our presentation of this story so you may see how we handled the whole thing.

Sincerely,

JACK W. GORE.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Jan. 24, 1963]

AIR COVER WAS AVAILABLE, J.F.K. SAID
(By Jack W. Gore)

The Kennedy administration has been accused of trying to "manage" the news. Now, this newspaper accuses it of trying to manage history.

Specifically, the history of one of the most embarrassing episodes of these times—the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy said this week that no U.S. air cover was ever planned or promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

He made the statement after he had presumably conducted an official "autopsy" of the invasion tragedy.

And it is presumed that the Attorney General had the approval of his brother, President John F. Kennedy, to speak for the record when he made his comments.

The News does not know if Robert Kennedy had the President's approval to speak or not.

But we do know that what the Attorney General said in print Monday on the United States neither planning nor promising air cover does not agree with what the President said on the same subject on May 10, 1961.

This is not speculation on our part. It's firsthand knowledge.

This writer lunched with the President in the White House on May 10, 1961, along with seven other Florida newspaper executives.

(The Attorney General was not present at the luncheon.)

On that day, less than a month after the invasion had failed miserably, the President told us air cover was available to protect the invaders, but that he had made the decision not to use our airpower.

The President explained that one of the reasons he decided against supplying air cover was because U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson had complained that any such action would make a liar out of him in the U.N. Up to this moment, The News has withheld comment on the President's admission for a very basic reason. At the conclusion of his comments on the Cuban invasion, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS noted that he hoped the Florida editors all understood that the President's comments were off the record.

Along with the other Florida news executives, the News accepted this request and has honored it for almost 2 years.

When the brother of the President of the United States, however, conducts an "official autopsy" of the sorry affair and makes official statements which are in direct contrast to the words of the President, we feel that any off-the-record pledge (asked by Senator SMATHERS) which might apply must be removed in the quest for truth.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Jan. 24, 1963]

PRESIDENT, BROTHER DIFFER ON WHAT REALLY HAPPENED AT BAY OF PIGS FIASCO

After Attorney General Bobby Kennedy's incredible attempt to rewrite the history of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion, it is no

great wonder Republican leaders in Congress are going to undertake their own investigation of this sorry affair.

What Bobby hoped to accomplish by coming out at this late date and denying that any air cover had ever been planned for the invasion is something we can't fathom in the slightest. Presumably, his intent was to whitewash the administration of the blame that has been heaped on its shoulders for leaving the invaders high and dry on the beach and easy pickings for Fidel Castro's counterattacking troops.

It is no doubt true that the invasion plans were originally hatched by the Eisenhower administration. Yet, it is also true that these plans were brought to the completed stage and put into operation under President Kennedy, and to us it is absolutely inconceivable that any military man would have even dared to suggest that an invasion force of just 1,500 men could be landed in Cuba and could defeat Castro's forces without the benefit of an air cover.

This simply wasn't in the cards and up to Bobby Kennedy's utterly ridiculous attempt to absolve the administration of any blame for deciding to hold back the air cover; it had always been believed that proper air cover was ready and waiting and needed just the word from President Kennedy to go into action.

In fact President Kennedy personally admitted this to be so at a luncheon he gave for Florida publishers and editors shortly after the invasion had been smashed and all kinds of recriminations were being tossed back and forth as to who was to blame. At this luncheon Mr. Kennedy frankly declared he had made the decision not to employ the American airpower that was close at hand for just such an emergency, and he further stated that one reason behind this decision was the fact that U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson had bitterly complained that any use of American planes would make him out a liar before the U.N.

The President also told the Florida newsmen that communications from the invasion site were so fouled up that neither he nor our military officials knew much more about what was happening than was being published in the newspapers.

To Mr. Kennedy's credit he made no attempt to disguise the fact that a boner had been pulled and it was clearly evident to all at the luncheon that while the President wasn't ducking his responsibility for the failure of the invasion, he was more than a little bit disturbed over the advice he had gotten that led to his decisions.

The Attorney General didn't happen to be at this luncheon nor was Pierre Salinger, the President's press secretary, or any other of his advisers. He talked bluntly and honestly to the publishers and the editors and nobody at the luncheon could but admire the President for standing up and admitting that a mistake had been made and taking the blame for it.

At the request of a Member of Congress, the President's statements at the luncheon were put on an off-the-record basis. And, during the 2 years which have elapsed since those statements were made, we and other Florida publishers have certainly honored that request.

As far as we are concerned, however, the release of a different version of the affair by the brother of the President necessitates, in the interest of truth, a recounting of facts as outlined by the President himself.

This Bobby Kennedy version adds up to something more than just rehashing a sorry period in American history. In retrospect, it not only appears that the Bay of Pigs invasion was ill conceived and ill carried out, but that some people in high places actually took steps to make sure it would be a failure even before it was launched.

We certainly don't put President Kennedy in this class. Being new in office he was forced to rely on the advice he was given and we think that the decisions he made, whether they were the right ones or the wrong ones, were based on what he felt was the best action in the best interests of the country at that particular time.

But if somebody did deliberately foul things up, that is something we think the American public should know, and if Congress can get access to the full story we certainly think it is that body's responsibility to make a thorough investigation and to clear up the confusion that has been caused by Attorney General Robert Kennedy's obvious attempt to becloud the real story of what happened.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Jan. 25, 1962]

NEWS STANDS BY CUBA STORY—THREE EDITORS DISPUTE KENNEDY'S DENIAL OF PLANE PLEDGE

(By William A. Mullen)

Despite a denial by President John F. Kennedy, the Fort Lauderdale News today held to its story that the President had confided to a group of Florida newspaper executives that he personally canceled air protection for the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961.

Jack W. Gore, editor and publisher of the News, said he was "not surprised the President has seen fit to throw his support behind his own brother."

Meanwhile, controversy continued over the air cover dispute, with a dominant theme that the President did not give a conclusive answer to the question at his Washington press conference yesterday.

Merriman Smith, United Press International White House correspondent, opened the press conference by asking the President about Gore's published story.

The President stated the intended air cover plan did not call for U.S. airplanes, but referred to aircraft controlled by the Cuban refugee forces not based in the United States.

DOESN'T RECALL IT

The President said he did not recall the luncheon conversation about the air cover with Gore and seven other newspaper executives at the White House May 10, 1961, less than 2 months after the invasion.

Several other sources, however, supported Gore's disclosure.

Martin Andersen, publisher of the Orlando Sentinel-Star, said he had recalled the conversation and added: "I have thought about it a thousand times. The air cover was canceled about 3 a.m. the day of the invasion."

John H. Perry, Jr., publisher of the Palm Beach Post-Times, said, after reading Gore's story and editorial in the Fort Lauderdale News: "To the best of my recollection that's substantially correct."

Robert C. Millar, publisher of the Florida Times-Union at Jacksonville, told the News this morning he recalled the conversation the President held with the newspaper executives, at which Senator GEORGE W. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, personal friend of Mr. Kennedy, was present.

"I didn't take any notes," Millar said in a telephone interview. "I would prefer not to make any comment."

In Jacksonville, SMATHERS said "there was no conversation with respect to U.S. air cover."

SMATHERS said he sat across from the President at the luncheon and added:

"I am certain there was no conversation of the character described by my good friend Jack Gore."

"The only reference I remember at all to this matter was that the President expressed disappointment that the air cover the Cubans were to have flown in the B-26's had not been more effective."